

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22, 24, and 25-27 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended, no claims have been added, and no claims have been canceled herein. Therefore, claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22, 24, and 25-27 remain pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Dutta in view of Malcolm**

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0103914 of Dutta et al. (hereinafter “Dutta”) in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2008/0172717 of Malcolm (hereinafter “Malcolm”). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting these claims, as amended. Therefore, the Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all claimed limitations must first be taught or suggested by the prior art. *See, e.g., DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2006). The Office Action must then provide an explicit analysis supporting the rejection. *See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007) (“a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art”). While the Office Action can use one of several exemplary rationales from the MPEP to support an obviousness rejection under *KSR*, all the rationales still require the Office Action to demonstrate that all the claim elements are shown in the prior art. *See* MPEP §2143. As will be

discussed below, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest each claimed limitation.

As noted previously, Dutta is directed to “filtering content based on the accessibility of the content to a user.” (paragraph 6) However, as noted by the final Office Action, Dutta does not teach or suggest “wherein said content is secure content, processing the web page prior to encryption of said content and analyzing the content of the web page prior to encryption of said secure content.” (final Office Action, page 3) Furthermore, Dutta does not teach or suggest a development process or environment, i.e., a development tool or a receiving a request for a web page from the development tool and performing filtering and analysis based on that request as recited in each independent claim. Rather, to any extent Dutta filters and/or analyzes content, such is performed in response to a request from the client.

Under Malcom “an information management system is described comprising one or more workstations running applications.” (Abstract) “Each application has an analyzer, which monitors transmission data that the application is about to transmit to the network or has just received from the network, and which determines an appropriate action to take regarding that data.” (Abstract) However, Malcom does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination with Dutta, a development process or environment, i.e., a development tool or a receiving a request for a web page from the development tool and performing filtering and analysis based on that request as recited in each independent claim. Rather, as with Dutta, to any extent Malcom filters and/or analyzes content, such is performed at and in response to a request from the client.

In response to these arguments, the Office Action maintains that Dutta does in fact teach a development environment as recited in the pending claims. In support of this contention, the Office Action cites the personalized accessibility evaluation provider of Dutta. As noted above, the Applicants contend that the personalized accessibility evaluation provider of Dutta is “an evaluation tool that evaluates requested content for accessibility to users having

special needs” (abstract) that “filter[s] content based on the accessibility of the content to a user” (paragraph 6). The Applicants respectfully contend that the personalized accessibility evaluation provider of Dutta cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest a development tool as commonly understood and as recited in the pending claims or a development environment performing the processes as recited. For example, the personalized accessibility evaluation provider of Dutta cannot reasonably be considered to teach or suggest a development tool for manipulating content of the web page by a developer, e.g., during testing or development or the web page.

Furthermore, neither Dutta nor Malcom teach or suggest, alone or in combination, mapping results of analyzing contents of the web page to the content, and returning the results and the mapping. Further still, neither reference appends the results to the content based on such a mapping and then displays or provides the content and appended results to the developer while the developer is modifying or testing the web page contents. Thus, the Applicants respectfully maintain that Dutta and Malcom, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each claim limitation.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-5, 7, 26, and 27 depend, recites in part “accessing said web page comprising said content with the servlet in response to a request from the development tool, wherein said content comprises secure content and wherein the request from the development tool comprises a request to modify the content of the web page by the developer; intercepting the request from the development tool with the filter and processing the web page with the filter prior to encryption of said secure content by the servlet; transferring the content of the web page from the filter to the analyzer; analyzing the content of the web page with the analyzer prior to encryption of said secure content, wherein analyzing the content comprises measuring conformity of the content of the web page with an established standard; mapping a result of said analyzing to the content of the web page; returning the result of said analyzing and said mapping from the analyzer to the servlet; appending the result of said

analyzing to the content of said web page with the servlet based on said mapping; and displaying the content of the web page and the result of said analyzing to the developer with a browser while the developer is manipulating the content of the web page.” Similarly, claim 9, upon which claims 10-14 and 16 depend, recites in part “receiving a request for said web page from a development tool for manipulating content of the web page during testing or development of the web page; generating said web page on a server in response to the request, wherein said content comprises secure content; processing the web page using a filter prior to encryption of said secure content; transferring the content of the web page from the filter to an analyzer; analyzing the content of the web page prior to encryption of said secure content, wherein analyzing the content comprises measuring conformity of the content of the web page with an established standard; mapping a result of said analyzing to the content of the web page; returning the result of said analyzing and said mapping to said server; appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web page based on said mapping; and providing the content of the web page and the result of said analyzing to a browser the developer while the developer is performing said testing or development of the web page.” Also, claim 17, upon which claims 18-22, 24, and 25 depend recites in part “accessing said web page comprising said content in response to a request from a development tool for manipulating content of the web page by a developer, wherein said content comprises secure content and wherein accessing said web page is performed during testing or development of the web page; processing the web page using a filter prior to encryption of said secure content; transferring the content of the web page from the filter to an analyzer; analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer prior to encryption of said secure content, wherein analyzing the content comprises measuring conformity of the content of the web page with an established standard; mapping a result of said analyzing to the content of the web page; returning the result of said analyzing and said mapping to a server; appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web page based on said mapping; and displaying the content of the web page and the result of said analyzing to the developer while the developer is performing testing or development of the web page.” Neither Dutta nor Malcom, alone or on combination, teaches or suggests a development process or environment, i.e., a development tool

or a receiving a request for a web page from the development tool and performing filtering and analysis based on that request as recited in each independent claim. Rather, to any extent Dutta and Malcom filter and/or analyzes content, such is performed when rendering a web page and in response to a request from the client. Furthermore, neither Dutta nor Malcom teach or suggest, alone or in combination, mapping results of analyzing contents of the web page to the content, and returning the results and the mapping. Further still, neither reference appends the results to the content based on such a mapping and then displays or provides the content and appended results to the developer while the developer is modifying or testing the web page contents. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Dutta in view of Malcom, and further in view of Brewer**

The Office Action has rejected claims 9-14, 16-22, 24, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Malcolm, and further in view of a publication entitled *Evaluating Web Sites for Accessibility*, by Brewer et al., W3C Web Accessibility initiative, November 7, 2002 (hereinafter “Brewer”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the reason that claims 10-14, 16-22, 24, 26, and 27 each depend on an allowable base claim as discussed in detail above. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

As for claim 9 and as discussed in detail above, neither Dutta nor Malcom, alone or on combination, teaches or suggests a development process or environment, i.e., a development tool or a receiving a request for a web page from the development tool and performing filtering and analysis based on that request as recited in each independent claim. Rather, to any extent Dutta and Malcom filter and/or analyzes content, such is performed when rendering a web page and in response to a request from the client. Furthermore, neither Dutta nor Malcom teach or suggest, alone or in combination, mapping results of analyzing contents of

the web page to the content, and returning the results and the mapping. Further still, neither reference appends the results to the content based on such a mapping and then displays or provides the content and appended results to the developer while the developer is modifying or testing the web page contents.

Brewer does not seem to correct these deficiencies. Rather, while Brewer may be directed to evaluating web sites for accessibility, Brewer does not seem to teach or suggest a development process or environment, i.e., a development tool or a receiving a request for a web page from the development tool and performing filtering and analysis based on that request as recited in each independent claim including mapping results of analyzing contents of the web page to the content, returning the results and the mapping appending the results to the content based on such a mapping and then providing the content and appended results to the developer while the developer is modifying or testing the web page contents. Rather, Brewer may describe, at best, an evaluation tool such as described in the background section of the present application that is separate from the development environment and thus suffers from some of the limitations as described therein. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Dutta in view of Malcom, and further in view of Berstis**

The Office Action has rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Malcolm, as applied to claims 1-5 and 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,458 to Berstis et al. (hereinafter “Berstis”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the reason that claim 25 depends on an allowable base claim as discussed in detail above. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/808,885  
Amdt. dated July 26, 2010  
Reply to Office Action of May 26, 2010  
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure  
– Examining Group 2164

PATENT

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. Daley/  
William J. Daley  
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
WJD:jep  
62790408 v1